



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/807,686	03/24/2004	Sandeep Relan	15487US01	4413	
23446	7590 09/08/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD 500 WEST MADISON STREET			BLOUNT,	BLOUNT, STEVEN	
SUITE 3400	ADIOON STREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO, I	IL 60661		2661		
			DATE MAILED: 09/08/2009	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/807,686	RELAN ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
	•	Steven Blount	2661				
Period fo	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		_	ddress			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stareply received by the Office later than three months after the med patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of the statutory m	a reply be timely filed nirty (30) days will be considered time DNTHS from the mailing date of this of ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on O	<u>3 June 2005</u> .					
2a)□	2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠	Claim(s) 1 - 7, 9 - 19, 21 - 22 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1 - 7, 9 - 19, 21 - 22 is/are rejected Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from consideration.					
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.					
10)	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abey	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor The oath or declaration is objected to by the	·	• • •	` '			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bur See the attached detailed Office action for a	ents have been received. ents have been received in priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No en received in this National	l Stage			
Attachmen	t(s)						
1) Notic	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)				
3) 🔲 Infor	ee of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/ er No(s)/Mail Date		o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application (PT 	O-152)			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1, 4-7, 9-10, 12-17, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of U.S. patent 5,903,225 to Schmitt et al.

AAPA discusses the problem associated with requiring users to access a computer system from a particular client terminal in a computer network. AAPA does not however teach providing a solution to the problem of "reduce(ing) the secure terminal to a dedicated terminal for accessing the computer network" by determining if a mobile device associated with the user and being separate from the client terminal is within a predetermined location.

Schmitt teaches determining whether a mobile device (transmitter 220 – see col 12 lines 45+) is within a predetermined location in order to determine whether or not to grant access to sensitive data. See col 12 lines 53+. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have solved the security problem of AAPA by using a geographic location device, in light of the teachings of Schmitt et al, in order to provide a means for securing a computer network.

With regard to claim 4, see the discussion of the use of a password in AAPA.

With regard to claims 5 - 6, AAPA teaches the use of a time varying password.

With regard to claims 7 and 9 - 10, see the rejection of claim 1 above and note that it would be obvious to implement the method in computer software in order to insure its repeatability.

With regard to claims 12 - 15, see the rejection of claim 7 and note the discussion of the use of passwords above.

With regard to claims 16 – 17 and 21 - 22, see the rejections above and note that there is a server inherent in the description of AAPA, since a client is specifically mentioned.

3. Claims 2 - 3 and 11 and 18 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of U.S. patent 5,903,225 to Schmitt et al as applied above to claims 1, 4 – 7, 9 – 10, 12 – 17, and 21 – 22, and further in view of U.S. patent 5,243,652 to Teare et al.

AAPA/Schmitt et al teach the invention as described above, but do not teach determining the location using a wireless network, or GPS system.

Teare et al teach a security device similar to Schmitt et al which uses GPS to determine the location.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the GPS system of Teare et al in AAPA/Schmitt et al to provide a means for simplifying the determination of the location of the mobile unit and its associated user when trying to access the client terminal.

Application/Control Number: 10/807,686 Page 4

Art Unit: 2661

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Primary Examiner